



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/559,643	12/02/2005	Jill MacDonald Boyce	PU040104	7307
24498	7590	06/28/2010	EXAMINER	
Robert D. Shedd, Patent Operations			THOMPSON, JAMES A	
THOMSON Licensing LLC				
P.O. Box 5312			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312			2625	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/28/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/559,643	BOYCE ET AL.	

  

<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
James A. Thompson	2625	

**All Participants:**

**Status of Application:** Before First Action on Merits

(1) James A. Thompson. (3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Gaspare Randazzo (Reg. # 41,528). (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 22 June 2010

**Time:** 11 AM

**Type of Interview:**

- Telephonic  
 Video Conference  
 Personal (Copy given to:  Applicant     Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:  Yes     No

If Yes, provide a brief description: .

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

N/A

Claims discussed:

N/A

Prior art documents discussed:

N/A

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

**Part III.**

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/James A Thompson/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2625

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner and Applicant's representative discussed the restriction requirement mailed 04 June 2010. Examiner stated that he had consulted his SPE Edward Coles and it was concluded that the restriction requirement was not a proper combination-subcombination restriction. Examiner further stated that the restriction requirement is therefore moot and a supplemental action is forthcoming.